DOCKET NO.: KAWA-1001 PATENT

Application No.: 10/541,523

Response to Office Action of June 15, 2007 Amendment dated December 11, 2007

Page -5-

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 9 through 11 U.S.C. §102(e). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the withdrawal of the currently pending rejections.

The Section 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 9 through 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by the Maroney et al. reference. The Examiner has pointed out that every element of the above independent claims has been disclosed by a single cited reference. Without necessarily agreeing with the Examiner's characterization of the cited reference, the Applicant has further amended to clarify the subject matter limitations of the current invention.

Newly amended independent claim 9 now each explicitly recites "obtaining a fiber fuse propagation threshold which is a minimal light output required for fiber fuse propagation is obtained by the following liner expression: Pth=0.15·D wherein Pth is a fiber fuse propagation threshold (W) and D is MFD of the optical fiber (µm)." Similarly, newly amended independent claim 10 now each explicitly recites "a fiber fuse propagation threshold Pth which is a minimal light output required for fiber fuse propagation is obtained by the following liner expression: Pth=0.15·D wherein Pth is fiber fuse propagation threshold (W) and D is MFD of the optical fiber (µm)." In other words, the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 9 and 10 calls for the "threshold value" that is determined by the specified equation, "Pth=0.15·D wherein Pth is a fiber fuse propagation threshold (W) and D is MFD of the optical fiber (µm)."

DOCKET NO.: KAWA-1001 PATENT

Application No.: 10/541,523

Response to Office Action of June 15, 2007

Amendment dated December 11, 2007

Page -6-

The above amendments to the independent claims are supported by the original

disclosure of the current application on page 26. Thus, no new matter has been added to the

current application by the above claim amendments.

In contrast to the above patentable feature of the current invention, the cited portion of

the Maroney et al. reference fails to anticipate the claimed threshold value determination based

upon the explicitly recited linear expression. Although the Maroney et al. prior art reference

discloses the Pth threshold determination in equations (1), (2) and (3) in columns 4 and 5, none

of these equation anticipates the claimed threshold determination.

Newly amended independent claims both require that the threshold determination based

upon "Pth=0.15·D," which is a lot simpler than the relations that are disclosed in the Maroney et

al. reference.

For these reasons, the cited reference fails to anticipate the patentable features of the

current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 9 and 10.

Dependent claim 11 is also patentably distinct since it ultimately depends from newly amended

independent claim 10 and incorporates the patentable features of the newly amended independent

claim. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submit to the Examiner that the rejection of claims 9

through 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claim

Newly added claims 21 and 22 respectively depend from newly amended independent

claims 9 and 10 and incorporate the patentable features of the newly amended independent

claims. The newly added dependent claims are supported by the original disclosure of the

current application on page 25. Thus, no new matter has been added to the current application

by the above newly added claims.

DOCKET NO.: KAWA-1001 PATENT

Application No.: 10/541,523

Response to Office Action of June 15, 2007 Amendment dated December 11, 2007

Page -7-

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

/KEN I. YOSHIDA/

Ken I. Yoshida, Esq. Reg. No. 37,009

Date: December 11, 2007

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY LLC Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350 Customer No. 21,302 1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd. Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215) 599-0600